



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,232	07/30/2001	Daniel Watkins	A4-4265/1C/1C 1496.00002c	4958
24319	7590	07/11/2006	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/17/06 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 & 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers, (U.S. Pat. # 4,920,432), in view Williams, (U.S. Pat # 6,195,797).

Considering claim 1, the claimed apparatus comprising;

‘drive server’, is met by the player controller network 3 of Eggers, which is a local video distribution system, such that the player controller network 3 operates the players 11 in response to instructions sent from the system supervisor computer 1, see col. 3, lines 5-64; col. 5, lines 24-26 & col. 6, lines 55-68.

The amended claimed ‘control server separate from the driver server’, is met by the system supervisor computer 1, which controls the storage and retrieval system of Eggers, (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 13-34; col. 3, lines 55-64 & col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for the further claimed, “configured to present a particular one of the one or more data streams received from the drive server on a particular one of a plurality of busses as determined by a particular one of a plurality of request signals’, Eggers teaches that the local video distribution system supports a plurality of cables 17 for distribution of requested video programming and a LAN 5 over a coax or fiber lines, see col. 3, lines 65-68 thru col. 4, lines 1-15. Eggers goes on to teach the local area network configurations are at least chosen from several standard options, see col. 4, lines 16-34.

As for the further claimed feature of, 'compressed data streams', Eggers does not discuss such a detail. Nevertheless, Official Notice is taken that compressed data stream were known in the art, i.e., MPEG, Para. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Eggers with the known feature of compressed video streams at least for the known improvement of conserving bandwidth, thereby enabling more information to be transmitted over the system.

'one or more decoder devices connected to the busses, such that the decoder devices are in a separate room from the drive server and control server, such that the decoder devices are configured to decode at least one or more compressed data streams and generate at least one of a decoded audio and video signal, reads on the above discussion, in combination with Eggers.

As for the amended subject matter of navigation software modules executable; in the control server, configured to generate control signals to program the decoders, Eggers does not teach this feature. Nevertheless, Williams teaches a control sever comprising Desktop modules that correspond with the workstation connected to the sever, see Fig. 2 & Fig. 10, col. 4, lines 1-60 & col. 5. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Eggers with the of navigation software modules at the control server, for the purpose of more centralized control of eth system as taught by Williams.

Considering claim 2, Williams meets the subject matter.

Considering claim 13, the claimed feature reads on the user in Williams selecting a particular program that is decoded from MPEG to be displayed on the TV.

Considering claims 5-7, 10-11, 16, the compressed stream were addressed in claim 1.

Considering claims 8, 15 & 19, Williams teaches the use IEEE 1394, col. 6, lines 3-10.

Considering claim 9, subject matter is met by Williams.

Considering claims 12 & 14, the elements of an apparatus comprising a drive server, or a method for distributing video, comprises elements that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1 and is likewise treated.

Considering claim 20, see Williams, Fig. 5.

Considering newly added claims 21-25, Williams teaches all subject matter.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers & Williams as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Wonfor, (U.S. Pat # 6,381,747).

Considering claim 4, Eggers does not discuss the claimed feature of a diagnostic mode. Nevertheless, Wonfor teaches placing a STB in diagnostic mode, col. 10, lines 5-10. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Eggers & Ellis, with the feature of placing a STB in diagnostic mode, at least for the purpose of implementing various features, as taught by Wonfor, col. 10, lines 5-15.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Fenwick Teaches controlling decoder devices from a control server.

Art Unit: 2623

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**


(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown

  
**REUBEN M. BROWN**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**